

WHEN WOMEN ARE MAGISTRATES

By FRANCES DUNCAN MANNING

WOMEN citizens may become rather intolerant about our courts of justice. They know a bit about the administration of justice themselves. In the average American home the entire administration of this department is in the hands of the woman. She it is who is on the spot. The mother who defers meeting out justice with a "wait until your father comes home" is incompetent, for each situation must be met as it arises. It is the mother, rather than the father, who must devise rewards for effort; it is she who must fit small punishments to the small crimes of little sinners.

Every Woman a Judge
In Her Own Right

Besides the large class of mothers, there are innumerable women whose jobs involve the administering of justice. There are the thousands of teachers, kindergartners, settlement workers; wherever it is necessary to have control over children or young folk almost invariably one finds a woman on the job. The trained nurse has the even harder task of securing obedience from the grown-up patient, who is often—especially if a man—wholly unreasonable.

The day has long passed since women felt it necessary to have a man's guidance, and the most cursory reading of the fiction of the day or the most casual survey of one's acquaintances proves that women constantly exercise this natural and acquired gift of training and guiding men.

To women the whole point of punishment is that it should be remedial. There is no gain if the young offender feels simply that he has somehow incurred parental wrath; it is the transgression or omission itself which the intelligent woman seeks to make definitely undesirable or inconvenient. Thus a child who is habitually behindhand is left at home; his wrath and wallings are of no avail. He will discover that dilatoriness is anti-social; that he cannot be allowed to spoil others' fun. A child who will not "play fair" is left out of the game. A child who annoys or injures others is put by himself.

Any woman knows as the very A B C of managing children that a healthy, well-nourished baby is a "good baby"; that a child happily occupied is a "good" child; that a boy or girl with plenty to do, with a proper balance of work and play, doesn't "get into trouble"; that a little supervision usually obviates the need of punishment. Occupation—suitable, enjoyable occupation—work that a child really likes—this any mother or any teacher knows is the thing of greatest importance. Mothers know also what teachers are likely to forget: that it is the clever, active, superabundantly vital child who gets into difficulties, while a youngster who is languid, dull and anaemic will almost surely classify as "good," but that the former is far more likely to amount to something.

Having this habit, this training in the administering of justice, this instinct of guidance, this idea of bringing out or seeing what is in the boy or girl that is of value, women will look at the administering of justice in the city and the state from a different angle than that of the average male voter.

The woman juror will want to "know why," will ask how it happened and whether the boy who stole had had enough to eat, what his work was and whether he liked it, and dozens of other questions which will seem to the city magistrate quite irrelevant. In his mind the only question is: Here is the prisoner; did he or did he not commit the wrong? No jury of women would have condemned to the chair so young a lad as Paul Chapman or condemned to the same fate the Russian, John Kuchneruck, who was but a bit older and



met his death by electrocution last May. In a Philadelphia paper some time ago there was an account of the escape of criminals from the Mercer County jail. The sheriff and a posse were giving chase. The "criminals" were a man of twenty-eight, accused of larceny; Hugh _____, thirteen years old, and John Eno, nine. The two little fellows

and that this was one of them. Women voters will feel more responsibility for the welfare of the children in the state than do male voters, for the welfare of the children has been their "job" from time immemorial. Women also will devise some more intelligent treatment of drunkenness than now obtains. As it is, no drunk-

drinks as they are now being issued 100 sugar; these would allow a man only so many. If his card allowance were exhausted, he would have to go without and go home sober, even if it were Saturday night. Or women legislators might introduce a measure that has operated with success abroad: that is, to give the drinking man a guardian



had been in the same cell and had assisted in the escape.

I wrote to Governor Brumbaugh to know if Pennsylvania had no more intelligent treatment for children of nine and thirteen than to jail them with an older offender. He wrote back that many things were wrong in the state which he was powerless to remedy—

and comes under state control until the disease of alcoholism is very nearly irremediable; then he may be sent to a hospital for treatment. Women would have state supervision step in earlier, as soon as the man became irresponsible, without involving him in the disgrace of jail.

Perhaps cards will be issued for

agreed upon by husband and wife. This guardian receives the man's wages, gives him what he needs each day for carfare, provides for the wife and children, pays the grocery bill, until such time as the drinker is himself again competent and responsible. It is not a bad idea.

Although the woman magistrate will

be lenient and kindly in the cases of juvenile delinquency, toward another type of offender she will be adamant. This is the man who traffics in the food supply and profiteers in necessities. For him she will have short shrift. And she will not dismiss such cases with a fine—not she! In fact, to the woman citizen the stock punishments of fine or imprisonment will seem even more clumsy than they do to men—as clumsy as if a surgeon were asked to perform thousands of operations and given only a saw and hatchet for the work. She will find new and interesting remedies.

She would have arrested on the charge of disloyalty men such as those who, in Pittsburgh the other day, were about to throw away carloads of onions merely to keep up the price. Through the quick action of Mrs. Taylor, head of the war garden committee, the food was saved, some given away, some used for seed.

But for such offenders a woman magistrate would have an excellent remedy. First they would have to learn the "golden text" which has been dinned into all our citizens: "Food will win the war. Don't waste it!" And then the lady Solomon would send these men where it is reported some of our prisoners of war are to be sent—to the farm camps. Here, under surveillance, a man who had thrown away onions would be made to plant onions, weed onions, do personal work with a hoe, week after week through a hot August; he should harvest and dry onions, too. So should he learn respect for the humble vegetable and repair the loss he himself had caused. After one or two years of such reeducation he would not be likely to throw away the results of a season's work. While the commission man was employed in completing his education a committee of women could easily be found to do his work.

For the profiteer my lady Solomon would have another remedy. This gentleman is even more notably patriotic than the other, but he doesn't let his right hand know what his left hand doeth. He waves the flag with the right hand while the other hand is in the pockets of the community. The woman judge would give him a chance to prove his patriotism. His is an industry

surely not needed in the prosecution of the war. If he were released for service at the front his work could most economically be assumed by a community organization, or by Uncle Sam himself, and the worthy man could have a chance to prove his patriotism in two ways: by his noble example in going to the front, and by thus withdrawing his hand from the pockets of the consumer. That luckless under-dog might then have money enough to buy Liberty bonds and Thrift Stamps—to say nothing of a little food.

Of Course There Are Men Charmers, Too!

Of course, women are not impeccable. "God Almighty," says George Eliot, "made 'em to match the men," and a certain type of male offender will probably do his best to secure a feminine jury. Solomon himself was not judicious where the ladies were concerned, and a good-looking affinity specialist will probably fare pleasantly enough with a jury of more or less emotionally unemployed women. The movie hero and others of that type might be found to do no wrong. Probably the Legislature will arrange such matters by insisting in such cases on a half and half jury—six men, six women. There should be a thirteenth—a clergyman. The same rule should apply in those cases where a pretty woman is the defendant, to whom men jurors are notoriously kind.

At all events, it will be interesting to see what the woman does with her vote—certainly she will do something with it. Whether, with her passion for cleanliness, she will succeed in making this dear old New York of ours into a spotless town remains to be seen. Whether she will succeed in looking after all the children and all the old folk no one can tell. Certainly she will try it. Selma Lagerlof says that one hears now and then of a "perfect" home, but that no one ever heard of a "perfect state" or a "perfect city"—that the home is the work of man and woman together, while the state and city are the work of man alone. It is exactly the elements that the woman furnishes in the home that are lacking in the city—the care and tenderness for little children, the kindness and care for the feeble and helpless, and the concern that none shall be hungry and rage unhappy. When woman shares in the governance of the state and city, Selma Lagerlof believes, she will of necessity bring these things with her.



Some Women and the Vote in England

It Is Better To Be Plain Miss or Mrs. Than to Have a Title if You Want a Voice in Your Country's Government

By MAY BOSMAN

THE news that Lady Rhondra has petitioned the British government to permit her, "as her right," to take her husband's seat in the House of Lords will be of peculiar interest to American women who can and do appreciate "gumption."

Until January 1, 1916, Lady Rhondra was plain Mrs. Thomas. Had her husband died then she would have a vote now, under the new order of things in England, which grants the right of franchise to women between certain ages. But on January 1, 1916, her husband was made a Peer of the realm. Because of that his widow has no vote, just as his wife would have had no vote.

There is one class of men in England who cannot vote: the highest. The man of title is denied the franchise granted to his valet and his chauffeur. But he has the House of Lords to sit in. He can vote all he wants to there, and although he cannot vote for Members of Parliament he can cast a vote to veto any measure passed by the House of Commons if it does not suit him.

Peers have no vote. No matter how rich and famous they and their families, they can have no voice in Britain's government—while every woman munition worker in the land, and the peers' own housemaids, exercise the newly-acquired right at the polls.

And there is no House of Ladies to console them, as there is a House of Lords for the men. What is to be done about it? Let them sit in the House of Lords, as Lady Rhondra proposes?

Lady Rhondra's request was refused. A British "House of Lords and Ladies" may do very nicely for food for "Punch," but the unchanging British people would zap at the effrontery of it.

petitioned the House of Lords to pass a clause in the Reform Bill giving peeresses a right which the lords themselves had not: the right to vote at general elections. It is said that the American women who are married to British peers were the first signers of the petition. The ladies stated that they did not ask this boon because of their war work, since so many men were giving up their lives that women's part must seem indeed small to the whole world; but they pleaded that "the future need of our voice in government justifies us in coming to you now."

The House of Lords apparently shelved their request. At all events no further word of it has reached the public. It is possible that the gentlemen may not be able to dispose of Lady Rhondra so easily. As was said, she has "gumption."

At the time of the presentation of the petition Lady Rhondra's daughter, who is Lady Mackworth and Viscountess Rhondra as well, was quoted as expressing great disgust at the discrimination against women of title. They had fought for the vote, worked for it, kicked policemen for it and hunger-struck in jail, the while their scullery maids stayed home and polished the pans! And now, forsooth, the scullery maids could vote, and they could not!

It does seem an unfair arrangement. The House of Lords is as old as Magna Charta, but when England decided about representation and election for her people she relegated the nobility to the background. They had made her suffer enough in the past by their power, and she would have no more of it! They could have their own house and vote for measures there, but "only the enfranchised commons can vote for anything and anybody else."

She gave no thought to ladies. How could she have guessed, then, that woman, the plaything and underling of the house, would want to run a government some day—and be capable of doing it?

She Whom the Antis Call "Nevada Anne"

By BELLE FLIGELMAN

RENO, Nev., is famous for two things. The other one is Miss Anne Martin, commonly known throughout the state as "Governor Anne." And it looks now as though the voters of Nevada might change her title to "U. S. Senator Anne" when the fall elections come around, so that they may boast of sending not only the first woman to the United States Senate, but of sending a woman who is well fitted for the job and one who knows economics as well as politics.

Student, Athlete, Professor—and Irish!

Anne Martin's race for the Senate is not a wild goose chase. She has been carefully prepared to meet and discuss the problems which confront the nation, and she knows the constituency which may send her to Washington. She was born in Nevada and grew up there, and scarcely a person exists in the state who doesn't know "little Anne Martin."

After she was graduated from the University of Nevada she took a higher degree at Stanford, and later studied government and politics at Columbia and at Cambridge, England. In the meantime she held the tennis championship of her state for three years, had a mountain pass in Nevada named for her in honor of her having climbed the peak in the dead of winter, and was professor of constitutional history in the University of Nevada for three years.

Anne Martin's grandfather came to this country from the North of Ireland, and his sense of humor still twinkles from his granddaughter's gray eyes when you ask her why a woman should be in the Senate.

Making the Desert Blossom Into Farms

"For the same reason that men should be in the Senate," she says. "Because they are people and they must take an intelligent and active part in the government under which they live. Women are used to the idea of voting now, and it is time to get them used to the idea of taking a more direct part in national affairs. Everything is centered in politics to-day—prices, wages, clean food, land to live on, education, war and peace. And the problems that are involved must be dealt with not by men alone nor by women alone, but by those persons, regardless of sex, who have considered them intelligently and who are able to solve them intelligently."

"Take, for example, the problems of my home state: Nevada is more than twice as large as New York, and its pop-

ulation numbers only 100,000. If the land could be developed for the people instead of being taken up by the big land and cattle corporations we could have a state of fertile, prosperous farms that would help to feed the nation. But modern farm development depends largely upon transportation facilities, upon low-rate farm loans and the mobility of seasonal labor.

"These problems are more than state problems. They are national problems, and they must be solved by the Congress of the United States if the people of Nevada and of the whole country are to benefit from the gifts Nevada holds in store for them."

The Franchise and State Boundaries

While Miss Martin was in England, studying at Cambridge, she became interested in the suffrage movement. Then she returned to her native state and started in to campaign for suffrage for Nevada women. The campaign was won, but she soon saw that immediately the enfranchised women of Nevada crossed the state line into a non-suffrage state they shed their franchise like a worthless garment. The only way to guarantee to the women of her state the right of suffrage, not only as citizens of Nevada but as women of the United States, was to secure the passage of a Federal suffrage amendment. And to



Anne Martin, of Nevada

this end she joined the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, since reorganized into the National Woman's party, of which she became legislative chairman.

The Platform of an Independent

Now she is to run for the Senate on an independent ticket—a political path which few statesmen have trod with success. It means not only that she will fight her final campaign against both a Republican and a Democratic candidate, but that her name will probably be placed in an obscure corner of the ballot, and the "casual voter," who, though he does not grow in such great numbers as he used to, is still a considerable factor in general elections, is likely to overlook her when he scratches his ballot. Nevertheless Anne Martin's chances for election are not to be despised.

Her platform is comprehensive and explicit. It begins with a pledge of loyalty to President Wilson and his war policy, and includes plans for the agricultural development of Nevada through conservation of waters and the opening up of new land under Federal and state direction; Federal farm loans at low rates; providing farms for returned soldiers; elimination of freight discriminations against Nevada, and the lowering of railroad fares for the protection of seasonal labor. A state and national prohibition plank is inserted as a war measure for the conservation of food materials and man power. And she concludes with: "Winning the spiritual issue of the war: to make the world safe for democracy."

Her Campaign the Opening Wedge

This last plank includes political democracy for men and women alike, and industrial democracy which will insure to labor not only the protection of regulated hours and wages and legislation for health insurance, but also a just stake in industry. Miss Martin also favors a readjustment of labor conditions affecting women, which will be fair to both the women and to the returning soldiers who will compete with them later on; and she espouses the cause of public ownership of public utilities.

"Whether I win or not," says Miss Martin, "my campaign will only make it easier for the next woman to run for the Senate, and women must learn that they must participate directly in government if they are going to contribute significantly and effectively to national, political housekeeping."



A Protest Against Quoting the Picketers

To the Editor of The Tribune:

As a woman in favor of suffrage, but affiliated with no special suffrage parties, I wish to protest against the portraits and opinions of two unpatriotic and disorderly women, Miss Alice Paul and Lucy Burns, in the suffrage section of your Sunday paper, dated August 11.

To follow the lead of these fanatical egoists is to encourage mob rule in America.

Suffrage for women, yes—but not in their wake! Cora Haviland Carver.

many kinds of new citizens, and they have varying points of view, to many of which we have given voice here. We have printed here the platforms of every political party in the country, including the Women Voters' Anti-Suffrage party—though, needless to say, we did not agree with them nor intend to "follow in their wake."

No single point of view of any group of women has been brought more conspicuously to the attention of the American public than that of the National Woman's party. Its force and organization and its ultimate aim we applaud, however much we may deplore some of its manifestations. The fact that we thoroughly disapprove its methods has nothing to do with our printing the statements of its policies and aims as made by its leaders.

ANNE LEWIS PIERCE, Director, Tribune Institute

Shall We Put a Child to Death?

Paul Chapman, aged sixteen, has been confined in the Sing Sing deathhouse since February, under sentence of electrocution for a murder of which he was convicted on a mere technicality of the law. The Tribune believes that no minor should suffer the death penalty, especially one who is guiltless at heart. If you agree, sign this petition.

M. de M.

Petition for the Life of Paul Chapman

To HON. CHARLES S. WHITMAN, Governor of the State of New York. Date 1918.

I, the undersigned, being of full age and a citizen of the State of New York, residing at the place appearing opposite my name, do hereby petition your Excellency with reference to PAUL CHAPMAN, convicted of murder in the first degree in the New York Supreme Court, Kings County, February 19, 1918, and sentenced to death, so that he may be

(a) Pardoned; or (b) Have his sentence commuted and be placed in a reform school until he is twenty-one years of age.

I do not believe that a boy of the age of Paul Chapman should, under any circumstances, be put to death. I believe that his execution is antagonistic to the enlightened spirit and sentiment of the best citizens of our commonwealth, and that his execution would be a standing blot and disgrace upon the administration of our criminal law.

Signature Address NOTE: Please strike out (a) or (b), as you wish, and send the above to Matthew W. Wood, attorney for Paul Chapman, 233 Broadway, New York City.